

REMARKS

Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment, claims 1-16 and 19-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13-16, 19, and 24 have been amended; claims 17 and 18 having been previously cancelled. Applicants believe that this Amendment does not add new matter. In view of the foregoing Amendment and following Remarks, allowance of all the pending claims is requested.

By the foregoing Amendment, Applicants have amended and/or cancelled various claims solely for purposes of expediting prosecution of this Application. Applicants expressly reserve the right to prosecute the subject matter of any claim pending prior to the foregoing Amendment, or any other subject matter supported by the Specification, in one or more continuation and/or divisional applications.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank Examiner Moon for granting Applicants' representative the courtesies of an Examiner Interview on August 25, 2009. During the Examiner interview, Applicants' representative discussed the claims in light of the rejections and the references relied upon by the Examiner as set forth below in further detail.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner has rejected claims 10-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants traverse this rejection because the claims are directed toward statutory subject matter.

Nonetheless, solely to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended the claims to recite "tangible computer readable storage medium," which is statutory subject matter. Accordingly, the rejection of the claims as amended is improper and must be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for antecedent basis. Applicants have corrected the informality. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection of the claims.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 10, 11, 13-16, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,125,385 to Wies ("Wies"). Applicants traverse this rejection because the reference relied upon by the Examiner does not disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention.

More particularly, Wies does not disclose at least the feature of "the virtual touch originates from a second communication device operated by a user to communicate the virtual touch to the first communication device" as recited by claim 1 as amended. Claims 10, 19, and 24 have been amended to recite similar features.

As discussed and agreed upon during the Examiner interview, Wies apparently describes providing force feedback provided when a user places a mouse pointer (for example) over a web page object, thereby providing force feedback that is correlated to the web page object. *See e.g., Wies*, Abstract, Fig. 10. Therefore, as discussed and agreed upon during the Examiner interview, Wies does not disclose at least the feature of a virtual touch communicated to a second communication device that originates from a second communication device operated by a user as recited in claims 1, 10, 19, and 24 as amended. For at least this reason, Wies fails to disclose all the features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, the rejection of at least claims 1, 10, 19, and 24 as amended is improper and must be withdrawn.

Claims 2-3, 11, 13-16, 20, 22, 25, 27, 28, and 30 depend from and add features to one of claims 1, 10, 19, and 24. These dependant claims are not anticipated by Wies for at least the reasons set forth above with regard to claims 1, 10, 19, and 24. Accordingly, the rejection of these dependant claims is improper and must be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 4-9, 12, 21, 23, 26 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wies. Applicants traverse this

rejection because Wies does not teach or suggest all the features of the claimed invention.

As discussed above, Wies does not anticipate claims 1, 10, 19, and 24. Claims 4, 12, 21, 23, and 26 depend from and add features to one of claims 1, 10, 19, and 24. Thus, for at least this reason, the rejection of claims 4, 12, 21, 23, and 26 is improper and must be withdrawn.

Claim 5 has been amended to recite features similar to claim 1 discussed above. As such, Wies fails to anticipate all the features of claim 5 as amended. Furthermore, for at least the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1, Wies does not teach or suggest all the features of claim 5 as amended. Therefore, the rejection of claim 5 as amended is improper and must be withdrawn. Claims 6-9 and 29 depend from and add features to claim 5. As such, for at least this reason, the rejection of these dependent claims is improper and must be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the Application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Date: **August 27, 2009**

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Hean L. Koo

Registration No. 61,214

Customer No. 26158

WOMBLE CARLYLE SANDRIDGE & RICE, PLLC
P.O. Box 7037
Atlanta, GA 30357-0037
Main: 404-872-7000
Direct Dial: 703-394-2274
Fax: 404-888-7490

WCSR 4194422v1